REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner's first rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al. (U.S. 5,394,445).

Specifically, the Applicant would like to point out that the invention disclosed in the Hogan prior art reference does not include either a (a) a "plurality of indicator lights," as indicated by the Examiner, and furthermore, (b) does not meet the items disclosed in paragraph j, claim 1. Therefore, even if it could be assumed that the "plurality of indicator lights" is obvious in lieu of the fact that the Ball et al. prior art reference does disclose one indicator light, then the fact remains that the manner in which the invention functions is different than what the Ball et al. prior art reference discloses.

Claims 2-10 are directly derivative of claim 1. As claims that are derivative of a claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, claims 2-10 also are in condition for allowance due to the fact they contain all limitations inherent in the base claim. Therefore, applicant believes she has traversed this rejection as well for claims 2-10.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above-described reasons, applicant submits that the specifications and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims define patentability over the prior art. In addition, applicant believes that his arguments in the "Remarks" section successfully traverses the objections and rejections brought forth by the Examiner in the Office Action. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action he respectfully solicits. If the Examiner feels that some of the dependent claims are allowable, the Applicant asks the Examiner to allow the Applicant to make any amendments to the allowed claims to incorporate all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Respectfully Submitted,

Matthew J. Peirce, Esq. Registration No. #41,245

Attorney for Inventor Frank Brooks